UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/179,405	10/27/98	KIM K	1293.1050/MD

WM01/1010

MICHAEL D STEIN
STAAS & HALEY
700 ELEVENTH STREET NW
SUITE 500
WASHINGTON DC 20001

EXAMINER	
DEANE JR, W	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2642	7

DATE MAILED: 10/10/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/179,405	KIM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	William J Deane	2642	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-16,18 and 19* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16,18 and 19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
20) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1 – 16, 18 and 19, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,091,808 (Wood et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,764,736 (Shachar et al.).

With respect to claim 1, Wood et al teach a number searching system comprising: a phone (10); a telephone database (42); a web server (34); an information terminal (see Col. 3, lines 49 - 55) which displays a searched for telephone number (see Fig. 3, element 68) and a telephone plug-in which automatically dials the displayed number (Compare page 6, lines 6 - 13 of the present invention with Col. 6, line 56 - Col. 7, line 5).

Therefore, Wood et al. teach the claimed device except for the plug-in having the ability to set up a communication channel through the telephone independent of the web server. Note that Shachar et al. teach such (Col. 5, line 60 – Col. – Col. 6, line 27. See also Col. 8, lines 19 – 26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided the Wood et al device with such an ability to set up a communication channel through the telephone independent of the web server as taught by Shachar et al. in order as such would only entail the substitution of one known plug-in for another.

With respect to claim 2, note that a PC (Col. 3, line 50) is used and that the phone (10) is a telephone.

With respect to claim 3, see Col. 3, lines 55 - 57.

With respect to claim 4, see Col. 3, lines 58 - 68.

With respect to claim 7, 13 and 19, note Fig. 1, and line 14 and 18. See also Col. 6, lines 56 - 66. Clearly, if the switch is checking to see if the phone 10 is on hook, two lines are involved. If it were checking the same line as used by the PC or terminal to access the web then the switch would always get a busy signal.

With respect to claim 8, see the rejection of claim 1 and note the ability to enter search terms that correspond to telephone numbers (Col. 6, lines 32 - 34 and Fig. 3, element 68).

With respect to claim 9, note Col. 5, lines 62 - 65.

With respect to claim 11, note Col. 8, line 66 - Col. 9, line 14.

With respect to claims 12 and 16, if the system of Wood et al is integrated as taught at Col. 3, lines 55 - 57, then such steps are inherent.

With respect to claim 14, see the rejection of claims 1 and 8 above. In addition, the link syntax is the hypertext tag (Col. 5, lines 62 - 65).

Claim 15, is inherent from the discussions above.

With respect to claim 10, Wood et al and Shachar et al. teach the use of a hypertext tags as discussed above. However, neither Wood et al or Shachar et al. do not teach the tags as being "<dialto> telephone</dialto>. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use any tag that was deemed appropriate to automatically dial a phone number.

With respect to Claims 5 – 6, Wood et al teach the claimed device as discussed above except for the ability to disconnect from the web server upon dialing and then reestablishing the connection to the web server. However, Shachar et al teach that such a disconnect and reestablishment of the connection is old in the art (see abstract, Col. 8, lines 40 - 43 and Col. 10, line 54 - Col. 11, line 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated the ability to disconnect from the web server upon dialing and then reestablishing the connection to the web server as taught by Shachar et al into the system and methods of Wood et al as an old means of convenience to a user.

With respect to claim 19, Wood et al teach the claimed device except for the idea of a second line. Note that Shachar et al. teach such at Col. 6, lines 24 – 27. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated the idea of two lines as taught by Shachar et al. into the Wood et al. device as such would only entail the substitution of one known connection set up for another.

Conclusion

2. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bill Deane whose telephone number is (703) 306-5838. In addition, facsimile transmissions should be directed to Bill Deane at facsimile number (703) 872-9314.

WJD
9/28/01

AHMAD MATAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600